R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 726 64

AN EXPLORATORY SURVEY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING BY TELEVISION IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY- REID, J. RICHARD
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSN. OF AMERICA, NEW YORK, N.Y.

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VIIB-020-2 PUB DATE NOV 61
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.72 18P. IN REP OF SURV. AND STUD. IN THE TEACHING OF MOD. FOR LANG., 197-211, NOVEMBER 1961

DESCRIPTORS- *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, INSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE, LANGUAGE AIDS, *FOREIGN LANGUAGE FILMS, TELEVISION, EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION, INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION, TELEVISED INSTRUCTION, TELEVISION SURVEYS TEACHERS, LANGUAGE TEACHERS, *TELEVISION TEACHERS, *LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, *SURVEYS, TEACHER SHORTAGE, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

AN ASSESSMENT WAS MADE OF THE EXTENT, STRENGTH, AND WEAKNESS OF CLASSROOM LEARNING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES THROUGH TELEVISION. INFORMATION WAS GATHERED BY MAIL, THROUGH VISITING 16 LANGUAGE PROGRAMS IN 15 AREAS OF THE COUNTRY, AND BY INTERVIEWS WITH TELEVISION AND CLASSROOM TEACHERS, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, TELEVISION PROGRAM DIRECTORS, AND STUDENTS. REPORT CONTENTS WERE DIVIDED INTO THREE PARTS--(1) CORROBORATION OF GENERAL IMPRESSIONS, (2) REFLECTIONS ON INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS, AND (3) DETAILED OBSERVATIONS RELATED TO HOW MUCH TELEVISION IS BEING USED, THE PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED, TECHNIQUES APPLIED TO MEET PROBLEMS, AND STUDIES OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT. CONCLUSIONS WERE THAT TELEVISION IS NOT THE ANSWER TO THE TEACHER SHORTAGE, BUT INSOFAR AS TELEVISION TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES IS PERFORMED BY SKILLED, INSPIRED TEACHERS, BACKED BY SOUND ADVICE FROM LINGUISTS AND PRODUCERS, AND BY A SOUND PROGRAM IN THE SCHOOLS, TELEVISION CAN HELP SOLVE THE TEACHER SHORTAGE. (JC)

File
Foreign Lang.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

B-0
No

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

An Exploratory Survey of Foreign Language Teaching by Television in the United States

J. RICHARD REID

Reprinted from
REPORTS OF SURVEYS AND STUDIES
IN THE TEACHING OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES
PUBLISHED BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
NOVEMBER 1961

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ED 003726

An Exploratory Survey of Foreign Language Teaching by Television in the United States

By J. Richard Reid

PREFACE

As part of a contract with the U. S. Office of Education under the National Defense Education Act to make quantitative and qualitative surveys of foreign-language learning in the United States, the Modern Language Association wished to get some assessment of the extent and of the strengths and weaknesses of classroom learning of foreign languages through television. Only a token survey was possible: one investigator working full-time for five months. We were fortunate to be able to persuade Professor Reid of Clark University to undertake the job. He had no previous involvements, commitments, or even opinions on the matter. But he is an experienced and skillful language teacher and an able linguist; readers of his report will, I think, agree that our choice was a happy one.

At an orientation conference early in the course of the survey, the following advisors were present: Nelson Brooks, Mary A. Brophy, Remunda Cadoux, Edith Kern, Earle S. Randall, and Gordon R. Silber. We are grateful to them for their sound advice and repeated helpfulness.

June 1961 Donald D. Walsh

"Is television the answer to the shortage of teachers? Can a single, skillful, inspired teacher, on a city-wide or nation-wide network, really do the work of a hundred or of several hundred classroom teachers? Or is the student's uncontrolled output vastly inferior to his TV intake? We are going to try to find out." With these challenging words from the Director of the FL Program, a survey of TV language instruction was undertaken this spring. The questions asked soon led to variations. We need to know not only whether TV *can* do the work of hundreds of teachers but also whether it is realistic to think that it will do so. Or, if it cannot do all the work of these teachers, can it be expected to do some parts of their work? As for the student's output, what teacher has not always felt it was vastly inferior to the input? We want to know how the TV student's output compares with the traditionally taught student's output, and why. Put differently, how much genuine language learning is taking place in TV courses, and to what extent is the use of the medium responsible? Or, still more simply: does TV seem to be a promising medium for language teaching?

The last form of the question is more modest, and it best accords with the answers. A one-man survey of so vast a field can only sketch the outlines and give a sort of educated guess as to the details. It has been an attempt by a linguist and language teacher, with no predispositions for or against TV, to take a critical look at the work of committed enthusiasts (may their tribe increase!), and to report what he saw. The survey involved collecting a large amount of information by mail, visiting 16 of the 70-odd language programs in 15 areas of the country, from Miami to San Diego and from Seattle to Concord, and talking with TV teachers and classroom teachers, school administrators and TV program directors, and students.

The contents of this report fall into three general categories: first, corroboration of certain general impressions that most of us would have had at the outset; second, reflections on the image of our profession which such a survey affords; and, finally, some fairly detailed observations related to how much TV is being used, what problems are encountered in its use, the techniques found to meet the problems, and studies of research and evaluation.

First, the general impressions which seemed corroborated: (1) The use of TV in language instruction is growing rapidly and seems clearly here to stay. (2) It is neither the answer to all our problems nor a fiendish invention that will destroy us. "The medium is neutral," to quote the cliché-and-jargon journals. It is just as capable of multiplying the effects of a bad teacher by spreading him over ten thousand TV screens in as many classrooms as it is of spreading the miracle of superb teaching. Without a doubt it is doing both these things now. (3) The average of TV teaching is probably better than the average of classroom teaching, though this clearly can not be proved. (4) There is some poor TV teaching, and a considerable amount of good TV teaching inadequately followed up in the classroom, and if there is consequent public disillusionment, we shall have been ill served, and we may lose many of the gains that we have made so painfully in the past decade. There is also great promise in the medium, which it behooves us to realize. The more detailed observations to be presented below may help in the weighing of the threat and the promise.

In reporting the image of the profession which the survey afforded, it seems appropriate here to express profound thanks not only to the group of advisors, but especially to Donald D. Walsh, Director of the FL Program, and to the scores of other people whom I asked for help. Without exception they put themselves generously at my disposal for as long as I could stay—usually, I am sure, at considerable inconvenience, though they never allowed this to be seen. They were admirably frank in discussing problems and eager both for news of other projects and for reactions and suggestions relating to their own. In fact, since this report is necessarily one of personal impressions, I am impelled to report that the semester's experience was one of swelling pride in belonging to this profession, by which I mean not only language teaching but American education in general. Some bitter and pessimistic critics have, surely, given an unfair picture of this dedicated, progressive, and capable group.

ITV. INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION

The term Educational Television (ETV) applies to all programs on the so-called educational television stations, and to others as well—in fact to virtually everything except straight entertainment. The term Instructional Television (ITV) has come into use to refer to TV programs that are part of a formal educational program, and that perform essentially the same functions as classroom courses. This survey was limited to ITV courses, and excluded FL programs broadcast for the general public, not used in school and not carrying any sort of academic credit.

The use of ITV is developing so rapidly that any statistics are obsolete before they are published. But some idea of the scope of the medium is given by the fact that although ITV is a mere eight or nine years old, it has been estimated that in 1960-61 there were 3.5 million school children in 7500 schools receiving part of their instruction by TV, and an additional quarter million college and university students in 250 institutions receiving credit for ITV courses. A single program—the Midwest Airborne Program on Television Instruction—will in the fall of 1961 start broadcasting instruction from aircraft circling over Montpelier, Indiana, to an estimated half million more school children in a six-state area. Without a doubt there will be hundreds of thousands of other additions to the ITV class rolls over the country. Programs currently emanate from facilities ranging from powerful commercial broadcasting stations to small closed circuit systems within a single building.

FL instruction accounts for a substantial share of this vast enterprise. The sponsors of the most widely used in-school FL program (syndicated to 14 stations in 1960-61) estimate that more than a million American children in the elementary grades were learning French from their series in the fall of 1960. There are literally scores of other programs each reaching many thousands. At present no agency is systematically gathering data of this kind. Consequently I can report only data gathered from the many fragmentary surveys and from correspondence. The list in Apoendix B, therefore, is neither systematic nor exhaustive nor completely accurate. It is probably, however, the most nearly complete and accurate list of FL instruction via TV available for the year 1960-61. It contains also a few items referring to plans for 1961-62 and to recently discontinued activity.

Why are we turning so extensively to television? Is it a desperate, stop-gap remedy for inadequate facilities, schools too small for adequate curricula, the shortage of qualified teachers? Or is it the exploration of a new medium that promises to add exciting new dimensions to teaching and to revitalize American education? Perhaps it is both. Henry R. Cassirer in his world-wide survey of ITV[1] observes that "television is used in the United States more to compensate for deficiencies than to provide new resources for education which make a contribution to the best of schools," and he urges a more positive approach. Many observers in this country have agreed. "Such innovations as . . . television should not be thought of as stopgap measures to surmount the immediate teacher shortage, but as the beginnings of a long overdue revolution in teaching techniques. The emergence of techniques that make it possible to reach large numbers of students economically (e.g., television and films) has led some observers to decry a mass approach to teaching. This is not a necessary consequence. All such techniques should only be used to extend the impact of exceptionally gifted teachers, or to perform teaching tasks that may best be handled by such techniques . . ." says the 1958 "Rockefeller Report on Education."[2] "We have not so far talked of television as the answer to the teacher shortage," writes Hideya Kumata, of the Michigan State University Communications Research Center. "Our position is that we look at television as an additional medium of transmitting knowledge. If in some instances it helps relieve the teacher shortage, all to the good."[3] And surely we are assailed on all sides by the assurance that everything from kindergartners' learning habits, to teachers, to school systems and even the whole of American education are being "upgraded" (space-age jargon for "improved") through ITV.

The issue is a confused one, and not easy to sharpen. Surely expediency is a factor in all our decisions. Is there any classroom that does not represent a compromise between the ideals of perfect educational facilities and the concern to make the dollar—and the teacher—go as far as possible? It is pertinent, however, to take a close look at the TV medium and try to identify both its unique qualities and its limitations, and to look for ways of overcoming the limitations.

Until one has experience with the medium, the limitations are more obvious than the positive contributions. Obviously the teacher of 50,000 unseen pupils cannot know them personally, cannot answer their questions, give them personal attention or adjust the pace of the lesson to what happens in the classroom. He cannot keep discipline, cannot encourage the shy or restrain the boisterous. But it turns out that there is a paradoxical quality to the relation between TV teacher and pupil. A curious closeness of personal relation develops. The TV teacher who looks at the camera seems to be looking directly at each individual viewer in a way that the "live" teacher in the classroom cannot do. It is as though each pupil were having a private lesson. This effect has been widely reported, and even before I had it called to my attention I was struck by it in observing my first large group (75 or more pupils in a double room) receiving their TV Spanish lesson. They were utterly absorbed in the lesson, responding aloud when asked, and seemingly oblivious to everything around them, showing the kind of concentration that even the most expert classroom teacher seldom achieves. Possibly this is undesirable in language learning; perhaps we need instead an environment in which all individuals are in communication with one another. But one cannot lightly dismiss the advantages of securing rapt attention for the superior teacher, and the *feeling* by the pupils that they are receiving individual attention. This effect is not attributable merely to the imaginativeness of children, since essentially the same effect has been reported for older viewers, as, for example, at the Chicago City Junior College.[4]

There are still more striking advantages to the technical versatility of TV equipment. As has often been said, every student, if he is within proper viewing range of the TV screen, has a "front seat." And no matter how large the group or the room, multiple receivers can put every viewer within proper range. Through selection of camera angle and focus he can be given close-ups, from a succession of different angles, concentrating his attention in a way that is impossible in the traditional situation. These features are particularly valuable for FL teaching. Good camera technique can show the articulation of speech much more clearly than it can be seen in the ordinary classroom. Articles used as realia can be enlarged on the screen and completely freed from distracting things in the environment, in a way impossible in the ordinary classroom. Further, if we are interested in introducing a maximum of cultural authenticity into our language lessons without interfering with the primary linguistic purpose, TV provides the means, in the use of sets and of authentic realia and visiting native speakers on a scale that would be impossible otherwise.

How, one might ask, can an audio-lingual approach be used when the teacher cannot hear the response of the students? The answer, if there is one, lies in dividing the teacher's functions between the TV teacher and a classroom teacher. This division presents many problems. But it has its bright side. One implication of the audio-lingual approach is the attempt to use "direct" methods where possible (i.e., to avoid or minimize translation as a part of presentation or as a part of the pupil's understanding). Such an attempt is helped immeasurably by presenting meanings through whole visual-auditory contexts. TV multiplies the possibilities of doing so by a large factor. The learner is transported via TV to any place, any situation, any environment that he needs for learning contextually the meaning of what he hears and says. Expert handling of the medium practically eliminates the need for translation.

A further advantage of TV is that every classroom teacher can learn by observation what successful teaching techniques look like. This advantage is potentially present of course, for all subject matters (and which of us can not profit by watching other teachers teach?). But it seems particularly important for the FLES classroom teacher today, because the American public is so eager to extend FLES teaching even though there are very few trained teachers. The same advantage will doubtless appear, though less markedly, at the secondary level, and conceivably even at the college level.

[1] *Television Teaching Today*. Paris: UNESCO, 1960, p. 16.

[2] *The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America*. America at Mid-Century Series, Special Studies Project Report v, Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Garden City: Doubleday, 1958, p. 25.

[3] *Proceedings of Conference on Educational Television* (26–28 May 1958), ed. Gertrude G. Broderick. USOE Circular No. 574. Washington, [1958], p. 39.

[4] *Chicago's TV College; Final Report of a Three Year Experiment*, by Clifford G. Erickson and Hymen M. Chausow. Chicago City Junior College, 1960, p. 32.

TV AND OTHER AUDIO-VISUAL MEDIA

Why should TV be thought of in isolation from the other wonders of technology such as moving pictures, recording apparatus of various kinds, and especially the language laboratory? Curiously, there has been very little experimentation reported so far with combinations of this "gadgetry." The principal exception is that film can be transmitted by TV, and TV programs are frequently recorded on film. Also, there are numerous TV courses supplemented by disks or by audio-tape recordings which supply drill material for follow-up practice.

There has been very little use of laboratories in conjunction with TV courses, though it seems a safe assumption that colleges giving courses to regular students via TV will tend to use laboratories there just as with regular classroom courses. The thorough integration of TV presentation, programmed learning drills, and laboratory practice has yet to be accomplished, though it seems likely that this development is not far off. One can imagine a closed circuit television installation, with multiple channels to transmit programmed language lessons to be received in language laboratory booths on individual TV receivers; the student would watch the lesson, record his responses, then perhaps turn to purely audio-drills or repeat the lesson, or progress to the next lesson when ready. A promising approach toward this kind of combination, at the University of Florida, will be described below.

Of more immediate interest is how TV compares with conventional moving picture sound film. There are advantages on each side. Film can be shown at any time and as often as convenient; it is far easier and cheaper to copy and distribute than videotape recordings; the picture is normally shown on a larger screen, and the camera has a wider focus. In favor of TV we find that the room need not be darkened, leaving the students free to take notes and making ventilation easy; the machine is silent, in contrast to the almost prohibitive noise level of classroom projectors; the sound track is usually acceptable, being comparable to radio, in contrast to the abysmal quality of most film sound; and, finally, TV production usually involves pre-editing, which makes for superior production quality, and greater versatility. Films are normally shot with a single camera, so that any change of angle or focus requires interruption of the action. But the TV studio normally has from two to four cameras picking up the action simultaneously from different angles. The studio director can see all these pictures simultaneously, changing freely from one to the other at the flick of a switch; and while one camera's picture is being transmitted, the others can be moved to new positions with no interruption. There is, of course, danger in getting so engrossed in making a "production" that we forget the educational purpose. But this is no reason for failing to exploit the potentialities of TV in the service of effective education. There are two opposed approaches to the ITV lesson. One is essentially to place a TV camera in a classroom and transmit the picture. The other is to bring the teacher to the studio and evolve new techniques derived from other uses of TV. It seems safe to say that the first of these is usually unsatisfactory, but that the second has some promise, only beginning to be realized.

Possibly a healthy competition between the film and the TV industries would result in some improvement. There seems to be no inherent reason why film projection could not be made acoustically adequate, except that the manufacturers are not interested. The projection of a TV picture on a wide screen has been done occasionally and perhaps needs further experimentation. Meanwhile, the use of multiple TV receivers in large rooms solves the size problem reasonably well.

VARYING ROLES OF TV IN INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

The TV component in a course may range in importance from being an incidental element added for enrichment—much as a film is occasionally brought into a classroom—to being the sole medium ("total teaching"). A fairly large segment of this range is represented by FLES programs over the country. The most frequent, however, is what is called using TV as a "major resource." That is, all of the presentation and most of the introduction to drill techniques are given in the TV lesson. Between TV lessons there is some sort of follow-up, usually directed by the classroom teacher, sometimes by a tape recording, but sometimes by traveling specialist FL teachers. The last technique naturally makes the most satisfactory arrangement, but reduces the importance of the TV lesson.

College experimentation has generally developed a different pattern. It uses TV as the major medium for presentation, but may add group meetings and laboratory practice. Studio production tends to be less elaborate in college than in FLES programs.

The Nebraska In-School Television-Correspondence Study Program, which was part of the Ford-sponsored National Program, experimented with TV lessons in what was otherwise a correspondence course, for rural high schools too small to offer certain subjects. Spanish was offered in the program, but it has been discontinued.[8]

AIMS AND METHODS

The courses under observation showed a rather wide variation in aims, sometimes explicit and deliberate, sometimes implicit and perhaps unexamined, sometimes dictated by economic necessity or public pressure. The differences seemed somehow sharpened up by television, perhaps because differences in approach are so exposed to public view, perhaps also because of the greater intensity or concentration in the whole performance, as compared with conventional classroom activity.

It seemed important first of all to try to distinguish between programs designed to "teach something" and those that are merely "enrichment programs," as one adviser to the survey expressed it. If we take "teaching something" to mean giving a solid foundation in the use of the language, and "enrichment" to mean communicating cultural understandings and attitudes, then clearly it is a basic distinction, and it was the first one applied in every observation. There is far from unanimous agreement on the relative importance of the two types of aim, and the difference of opinion is particularly sharp and troublesome at the elementary school level. On the one hand we have the strong statement of policy of the Modern Language Association, published in *PMLA* for May 1961, discouraging FLES teaching unless it is (1) done by a qualified teacher, (2) taken seriously as an integral part of the school day, and (3) followed through with an FL program running through grade 12. Clearly FLES instruction is here seen as standing or falling on whether it leads to mastery of the language; if it is interrupted or terminated prematurely, the implication is that it is a waste of time. But this view is not universally accepted, and the objections are not trivial. "We are not trying to make linguists of our children," one ETV Coordinator told me. Or as a prominent professor, identified also both with TV and with FLES, said, "we don't teach history and arithmetic to children for the purpose of making historians and mathematicians of them. FLES pupils are not just younger college language students." Surely the cultural learnings for children may be even more important than—even the principal reason for—linguistic learning. The by-products may be more important than the language itself, as with history or literature or science. One large FLES-

[8] *The National Program in the Use of Television in the Public Schools: A Report on the Second Year, 1958–59* (duplicated typescript). New York: The Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1960, pp. 74-78.

by-TV program was conceived first as enrichment to social studies; while the quality of language learning is not very high, enthusiasm is intense, and the education in intercultural attitudes seems worthwhile. Must we condemn the course?

This is no place to attempt to solve the problem, but it must be considered here because the movement to use TV is so closely bound up with it. TV is the occasion of an explosive expansion of FLES instruction, in answer to public demand, partly engendered by our own professional organizations. One state FL director pointed out that in his state the number of FLES programs was over three times as great in 1960-61 as in 1959-60, despite the fact that several school systems dropped the program in 1960. Over 70% of the programs use a newly available TV series, which shows clearly the possible effect of TV. Some of the school systems use the series well, providing qualified teachers to handle the follow-up, and planning adequate instruction in the higher grades. But in others no such provisions have been made. This FL director is justifiably afraid that the public will become disillusioned when it discovers that it bought an FL program but its children did not learn the FL. Will this not harm the whole cause of FLs? The question needs a thorough airing and open-minded, frank discussion, particularly in the context of television.

One point that needs to be made is that there is an apparent misconception involved in the statement that we are not aiming to make linguists of our children. Leading children to mastery of an FL is not making linguists or linguistic specialists of them. Leading them to master the operations of arithmetic is not making mathematicians of them; but we want the mastery, and no nonsense! The question is whether mastery of an FL is not better regarded as one of the basic skills, like arithmetic, than as the rare and relatively useless accomplishment of dilettanti, which is the traditional picture in this country. Does modern life require this change in attitude? If so, then the crucial question is "why in elementary school instead of later?" But here the evidence is almost overwhelming. Practically every investigation of the matter, whether by linguists, psychologists, or neurologists, reinforces the conviction that young children have a unique capacity for *language* learning that can never be duplicated later in life.[6] To expose them ostensibly to FL instruction without capitalizing on this peculiar capacity seems cruel in its shortsightedness.

At any rate, say some, let's be clear about it. If it is a social studies program, let's label it as such, and reserve the name foreign language for courses aimed at genuine language learning. To do so would without a doubt cause some changes in published ITV schedules!

The use of cultural materials: We still have not dealt in any significant way with the nature of the relationship between cultural and linguistic learning. As the anthropological linguists show clearly, there is an intimate relation between the two, such that neither can be quite valid without the other. In terms of means and ends there is a circular relationship. If our ultimate ends are intercultural insights and attitudes, a means is the language. An essential means to language learning is cultural insight. The two are not opposed but mutually complementary. The culturalists need have no quarrel with the linguistically oriented, as long as the latter provide cultural information and insights; and the linguists can be satisfied as long as cultural material is chosen specifically for its contribution to linguistic learning. This would seem to be the way out of the impasse (though it still provides no answer to the problem of securing proper conditions for language learning).

The language can scarcely be authentic unless it is embedded in a complex of cultural experiences and understandings. TV is precisely the medium best designed to bring to the learner these experiences. Trips to Europe are expensive. The elaborate combinations of visual and audio materials which make up the "Images de France" complex, produced at Wayne University, may also be too expensive for a single class or school. But when they are used over TV for thousands of viewers, cost ceases to be a major factor. We need to know more about the psychology involved, however. The TV program which makes probably the most extensive use of cultural materials has been seriously criticized for including such a confusing mass of new experiences that attention is distracted from the linguistic point of the lessons. This criticism came first from the originator of another TV series in which all distracting elements are carefully excluded, so that the learner's attention is completely focussed on the linguistic pattern. But it came also from a college instructor of a TV course, who had exactly the same reaction after using a rich proportion of the superb Wayne University visual materials. Finally corroboration comes from the University of Florida, where Professor Theodore Mueller reports that he also had to reduce the proportion of the Wayne visual materials and the situational content of the lessons. As he expressed it in an address to the AAUP, "The Science of Communications suggests an answer. It divides an utterance into a 'code' and a 'message.' When in the first semester we try to teach a language through its message, a message is taught with which the student has no experience through a code which is unfamiliar to him. . . . The visuals may distract." True, the science of communications seems based on a very primitive psychology indeed: the relation between what we say and how we say it is ultimately not simply one of code and message, the two being inextricably interdependent. But the principle still seems valid on this level of operation. In any case, the TV language courses can be classified according to the relative importance given to language on the one hand and cultural materials on the other, as well as how well the two are related and mutually supporting. To do so in any very convincing way, however, would involve intensive research, many times the scope of this survey.

Direct understanding or translation? Striking differences were also observed on the basis of whether the attempt is made to produce direct understanding *in* the FL or whether each word and each expression is translated into English. One course will say: "It is raining. Il pleut. Il pleut. It is raining. Il pleut. Now see if you can say it. Il pleut." Another course presents a skit with two children looking out the window; seeing the dismal rain one of them says, with intonations of childish disappointment: "Oh, là là! Il pleut encore! A quoi on joue?" In this series (Parlons Français), the same words are heard repeatedly, under slightly varying circumstances, the TV teacher directs repetition of this and the two or three succeeding speeches many times, and the pupils memorize the whole dialogue, which they dramatize enthusiastically over a period of weeks. This is *d'rect* audio-visual teaching at its best. Perhaps the greatest contrast is furnished by a few courses which take the trouble to provide visual context sufficient to carry the meaning and to support direct method, and then proceed to waste all these efforts by constantly translating the words into English. This seems a sad futility, and it characterized almost half of the programs observed.

Speech? Writing? Grammar Rules? Another important distinction is between courses using a thoroughly audio-lingual[7] method and those proceeding either from the written word or from grammatical principles offered for deductive appli-

[6] See, for example, the statement by the neuro-surgeon Wilder Penfield, "A Consideration of the Neurophysiological Mechanisms of Speech and Some Educational Consequences," in the *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 1953, LXXXII, 201-214.

[7] I do not here follow the tendency to extend the term *audio-lingual* to mean everything that is good or "modern" in FL teaching. I mean simply giving primary importance to hearing and speaking the FL rather than other activities.

cation. With the latter also must be classed programs which devote a large amount of time to translation or to incidental comments or explanations. From the fragmentary evidence available, it seemed possible to rank fairly far toward the audio-lingual pole (as here defined) the programs of Chapel Hill, Pasadena, and Urbana, as well as the Language Through Television courses. The latter differ from the others in their smaller use of foreign cultural context and greater concentration on relational context, involving language structure; they also introduce reading fairly early and develop it more systematically than most programs, while carefully basing the written on the spoken language. At the opposite pole from these is an engaging recorded course now seven or eight years old (i.e., prehistoric by the standards of these days of change), and now put out to the evening, out-of-school, pasture. This series gives every word first in its written form, spells it out (in English), has the pupil write it, gives observations on the spelling system and on the articulations of difficult sounds (presented as ways of pronouncing letters), and finally gives the pronunciation several times, asking for repetition.

An interesting and possibly promising "eat your cake and have it too" approach was seen in the Athens, Georgia, course, where the last third of each lesson was devoted to the written language, making it possible for the individual school or teacher to choose to include this portion or not, and likewise insuring that the oral-aural portion stood on its own feet. The program is being revised for 1961-62, however, and will probably not contain this feature.

Though we may differ as to the timing of the introduction of written material, there is no essential conflict between an audio-lingual approach to language and teaching students to read what they have already mastered in its spoken form.

Grammatical explanation as a means of presentation constitutes another departure from audio-lingual method. It is still practiced generally in college classrooms and their supporting texts, despite some publishers' statements to the contrary. The Chicago City Junior College TV courses were observed to use a rather standard proportion of grammatical discussion, and to use it effectively—in combination with both oral and written drill work.

Structure or vocabulary? Perhaps the most significant area of difference, and the most disturbing from a linguist's point of view, is the distinction between courses which are primarily vocabulary and those which teach the structure of the language. Though TV courses in general exhibit probably more evidence of linguistic sophistication than the general run of classroom courses, it is still not unusual to encounter the view that since a course is "conversational," grammar has somehow been abolished. In this view, conversation is apparently "just talking" and there is no structure to learn. The extreme illustration of this position is furnished by courses in which the main if not the sole activity is giving words to be learned. But not basically very different is any course in which although the language is idiomatic and the utterances are complete and natural, only the situation has received thought and the linguistic structures are uncontrolled. How many times must we learn that the "natural method" of learning a language is admirable for infants and horribly wasteful for other people? Have these people not absorbed the lesson contained in Mark Twain's observations on "The Horrible German Language"? The extreme of control of structures was exhibited by the Language Through Television courses, where the focus on structure is felt by some people to rob the lessons of sufficient situational interest to motivate children.

All the observed programs were approached with two principal criteria in mind (together with due humility, in view of the danger of overgeneralizing from fragmentary evidence). The first was: do these pupils produce correct sentences themselves, and do they make proper choices among familiar utterances according to the critical features of the context—linguistic as well as environmental—or do they only repeat entire memorized utterances, unable to vary them to meet a new context? Having been taught to say *le papier est blanc, la chemise est blanche, le livre est vert* and *la maison est verte,* the pupil is given the new word *la feuille,* and asked "De quelle couleur est la feuille?" In one class the answer is "la feuille est verte," a sentence never before heard, or "elle est verte," a sentence heard, but chosen among a repertory of alternatives. This is real language learning. In another class the answer comes: "vert." This is vocabulary learning. It is this class that is likely to answer "Comment allez-vous?" with "Je m'appelle Jean."

It seems clear that pattern learning depends usually as much on the follow-up drill as on the TV lesson. The pupils of the classroom teacher who holds up several pieces of paper and says "¿Cuántos papels son aquí?" are not likely to learn Spanish, no matter how well and readily they are able to shout "cuatro!" This teacher, by the way, is in no way to be blamed. She makes no claim to know Spanish, but is willing to cooperate with the TV course as well as she can. There were numerous examples of this type, but on the whole the majority of the projects gave a surprisingly good account of themselves.

Communication or a game? The second of the two criteria mentioned above was: is the FL being used as the medium of communication between pupil and teacher and between pupil and pupil, or is it simply an interesting word game played in a frame of English? In follow-up sessions with classes of 4th grade beginners, one teacher gave all instructions in the FL, secured the lively and delighted response of the pupils also in the FL, and all at a pace far too fast and too natural to allow mental translation. True, the teacher was a travelling FL specialist. But she was not the regular follow-up teacher of these TV pupils—that was their regular classroom teacher, who did not know the language before the TV experience. No one can observe such performances and have doubts about the *possibility* of FLES by TV. Whether such results are likely in general is another question.

Teaching or presentation? Another difference that stood out starkly was between lessons which *teach* and lessons which *present* the language. "Today's program will present the vocabulary for the restaurant," says one type of announcement; and it does exactly that. Never a hint as to how the student might go about learning to use the material. Such lessons are more typical of the adult evening course, but not unknown among the in-school programs. However, the surprising thing is not that it occurs, but that it is so often avoided. It seems likely that the principal flaw in traditional FL teaching has been that the teacher *presented* and *tested* but left the student on his own to find some way of learning. In fact even the presentation was often omitted, since the textbook could take care of that. One would have thought that TV lessons might necessarily be limited to presentation, in view of the limitations of time and of one-way communication. But the fact is that, whether despite these handicaps or because of them, many TV teachers have met the challenge, and actually squeeze more real teaching into their short telecasts than many of us get into our class periods. The techniques in FLES courses on TV seem to be two, used in deft combination. First, the child is brought into empathetic relation with the teacher and the environment presented to him; then he is led to repeat and respond constantly. When the repetitions and responses are structured by the patterns of the language as well as the situation, language learning is taking place.

COLLEGE COURSES

The goals of college FL teaching are usually somewhat different from those in the earlier years. Though the college wants the student to acquire facility in using the language, it usually wants him also to develop more intellectual understanding of language as well. Time is too short for the slow pace which works so well in elementary school. Consequently the college course tends somewhat more toward the "presentation" form on TV, and is likely to make more and earlier use of the written language, and in general to resemble the traditional college language class. This can be effective, and seemed so in the one case actually observed, at Chicago City Junior College. For a description of another college course, see Leroy R. Shaw's account of his University of Texas experience in the *German Quarterly* (March 1961, pp. 146-153). Herbert W. Reichert of the University of North Carolina, in "Conventional Textbooks in the Foreign-Language Telecourse" (*German Quarterly*, Jan. 1959, pp. 35-42), says that conventional texts and something like conventional methods can be used on TV. Similarly, Professor Ferdinand Gowa, Chairman of the Department of Modern FLS at Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee, reports that regular textbooks and readers are used in their TV course in German (given since 1956-57) and in French (new in February 1961). Such courses use TV rather differently from FLES courses. However, experimentation going on at the University of Florida may well show the way to as distinctive a use of TV in college as has developed for FLES—and involving teaching as well as presentation.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN TV INSTRUCTION

Reception: The TV screen is small and the image often lacks clarity and brightness. The sound system of TV receivers has not received adequate attention for FL work. A room with poor acoustic properties can make the best audio systems inefficient. While one solution to the problem of the small screen would be large screen projection, the use of multiple receivers—4 to 6 in a room for up to 300 children—is proving quite satisfactory. But I observed TV lessons in two small rooms with acoustic conditions so poor that it is difficult to imagine anyone learning a new word correctly from the telecast. The best FL programs will be ineffective if the speech cannot be clearly heard. The physical problem of good TV reception in school rooms has been treated with absorbing interest and real creativity in *Design for ETV*, a publication of Educational Facilities Laboratories (prepared by Dave Chapman, Inc., Industrial Design, New York, 1960).

Wasteful duplication: It is vastly more expensive to produce a TV lesson than a traditional classroom lesson. The added production cost is justified on the basis that it reaches great numbers of students. But the high production cost brings with it the responsibility not to be wasteful. Is it justifiable to produce a TV course without a clear idea of how to go about it, or with any but the superior, experienced teacher? When is it justifiable to produce a course locally, when the kinescopes or videotapes of an existing TV course could be purchased or rented for a fraction of the cost? The surprising number of different courses being produced during the past year makes the question a pressing one, since they are often severely limited financially, and the TV teacher is also tied down to production when he might be more useful visiting classrooms, conducting follow-up for a TV course already recorded. As one ETV supervisor remarked, there is probably a certain amount of "empire building" involved. But there is also a genuine desire to learn by experience. Two possible extremes are to be avoided. One is the concentration of huge resources into a very small number of programs distributed all over the country; the other is a multiplicity of "experiments," each project working in something of a vacuum, following hunches, and oblivious to developments elsewhere. In the first case, experimentation will be discouraged, and the huge investment in production will effectively bar change and progress. In the second case, stagnation is also likely, through lack of profiting by other people's experience. As one FL supervisor put it, "Why should everyone have to invent the telephone?" As in science, we should learn from other people's experiments as well as our own and be willing to use what they have produced. A study designed to facilitate the distribution of recorded telecourses was completed in May 1961: *A Study of the Use of In-School Telecast Materials Leading to Recommendations as to their Distribution and Exchange*, by Jack McBride and W. C. Meierhenry, Co-Directors, and D. L. Grassmeyer, Project Director (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska and USOE, 1961).

Definition of the TV teacher's job: The rights and responsibilities of classroom teachers seem widely understood and agreed upon. But the TV teacher is in an uncertain and ambiguous situation. First, how do we define full-time work? Many different answers are given to this question. In some college situations, the teacher has given the telecourse in his spare time, for the small salary of a single course in the Evening College or Extension Division. Elsewhere the telecourse has counted as one course in a 12 or 15 hour schedule. At another institution the teacher first spends 8 summer weeks at full pay preparing the course and taping the first few lessons; and then during the semester in which the course is broadcast, it counts as his full teaching load (though this is apparently being cut to 50 or 60 per cent). He is thus able to give some classroom instruction as follow-up to the TV lessons, to require some written work, and to make other additions to the mere production of the TV lessons.

In 1958 at the University of Illinois there was an experiment with TV used as an adjunct of a beginning French course. Grammar was presented in a weekly thirty-minute TV lecture; drill and reading occupied the four regular meetings. The TV instructor was relieved of 4 hours from his regular load, but found it took him at first 15 to 20 hours, and later about 10 hours, to prepare his materials. Achievement surpassed that in conventional courses, but not more than might be attributable to the additional thirty minutes of teaching. Other institutions have approached the problem less deliberately, and perhaps less realistically, and have not found TV so time-consuming. But the Illinois experience does not stand alone.

In the FLES field, the range is all the way from full-time credit for producing three TV lessons a week to the case of the teacher who gives a FLES series at two levels, each with three weekly 15-minute telecasts, plus a weekly lesson for teachers in each level; to which she adds making all her own props and visuals, typing, mimeographing, and mailing teachers' guides, and visiting every classroom at least once during the year; she teaches a graduate course in methods in her spare time.

How often should the TV FLES teacher visit classrooms? This pattern too goes to extremes. One teacher who has never taught in a classroom is so busy with production and planning for the next series that she visits no classes at all. That she is very effective seems miraculous, in view of the generally accepted opinion that the successful TV teacher must have first been a successful classroom teacher. At the other extreme is the teacher who visits from ten to twenty classrooms every week, which takes her to each of her classes at least once a year, some of them two or three times.

What are the relations between the TV teacher and the production staff, particularly the producer and the studio director? People are often apprehensive about this problem. Will the producer be so concerned with making a "show" as to ignore

or over-rule the desires of the teacher? Will the director follow his own judgment rather than the teacher's in matters outside his competence, such as whether to give a close-up showing speech articulation? These difficulties actually seem rare. The relations were apparently most cordial and cooperative in every locality visited.

Must the TV teacher produce his own materials and lessons, or can published materials be used? Most people, rejecting published texts as inadequate for TV, have taken on the burden of planning their lessons, writing scripts and teachers' guides and other aids. However, since the appearance of the MLA's *FLES Guides*, many if not most of the FLES telecourses have drawn on them widely, thus saving time and also providing a welcome common core to instruction over the country. As for college, although some have written special materials, Herbert Reichert of the University of North Carolina has concluded (see the reference under "College Courses") that there is no reason for not saving time by using published textbooks.

Rights: At only one institution was the question raised which will doubtless plague others before long: who owns the rights to recorded courses? Does the teacher who has written his own materials have the same proprietary interest as he would have in a textbook he had written?

PROCEDURES EMPLOYED IN FL PROGRAMS

The limitations and the special potentialities of the new medium have called forth a variety of special procedures. Some show considerable ingenuity. Since solid testing and evaluation are rare so far, it is possible only to report some of these procedures which upon brief inspection have seemed to be contributing to effective teaching, or to be likely to do so. Although purely technical matters are really outside the scope of this survey, some basic technical information is furnished as well, since those unfamiliar with TV production will find it easier to get a clear picture of what is involved in TV teaching of FLs if they have this information. In most cases, one or more programs using the technique will be identified. The programs mentioned are listed in Appendix A, with addresses, and the name of the TV teacher or other official in most cases. It must be emphatically stated that this is in no sense an "honor roll." There are probably other programs using the same techniques; there are doubtless still better techniques that are not included. The omission of reference to any program visited is in no way a reflection on the quality of the program.

Technical: Many programs are broadcast live (not recorded). Examples: Anaheim, Calif., Chapel Hill, N.C., Urbana, Ill. Others are recorded on videotape for rebroadcast the same day or week, but not for permanent storage. (Videotape recording is a process exactly like audio-tape recording, except that the picture as well as the sound track is magnetically recorded on coated plastic tape. The quality is practically as good as that of live transmission, and considerably superior to that of film. The material and the recording process are expensive. The tape, like audiotape, can be erased and re-used repeatedly.) Examples: Miami, occasionally Chapel Hill. Other programs are recorded on videotape for permanent storage and future use. Examples: Pasadena, San Francisco, "Parlons Français." Midwest Airborne plans to videotape all programs on a master tape, in production studios, then copy the master for actual broadcast.

A number of programs are produced on kinescope film as their primary means of distribution. A kinescope is a film reproduction of a TV picture. It may be made at the same time that a program is being transmitted live. It is used, like videotape, for repetitions of the program and for quantity distribution. It can also be projected with ordinary moving picture projectors. Although the picture and sound quality are inferior to videotape, there are advantages: film is far cheaper than magnetic recording tape, and is far more economical to reproduce in quantity. Examples: Language Through Television courses; San Diego, Calif.

Ordinary moving picture sound film as well as kinescope can be transmitted over TV. A part of the "Parlons Français" distribution is planned by color film, which may be used either on TV or in the classroom. This film is noteworthy in that it will inaugurate the newly developed 8mm. sound film, which it is said will reduce educational film costs by 70% over conventional 16mm. film, and with comparable quality.

Some programs are broadcast over commercial TV stations; most over educational stations. Closed circuit projects (ccTV) are few in number, but worth consideration. Transmission is by cable instead of broadcast; reception limited to receivers having direct wire connection. The principal advantage is that the cable can carry up to six programs simultaneously, thus being equal to six broadcast channels. Example: Anaheim, Calif.

Broadcasting from an airplane circling at 23,000 feet and over two simultaneous channels will be employed by the Midwest Airborne. This gives a radius of about 200 miles in contrast to approximately 75 miles from ground-based broadcasting. The question has been raised of what will happen when weather prohibits flying. The answer given was that the average number of days when flying is impossible is smaller than the average number of days when schools are closed on account of weather. The answer to this answer is that the foggy weather that grounds planes is not the snowy weather that closes schools.

Reception of most programs is through ordinary TV receivers. However, in Pasadena, some schools have "listening-viewing centers" (embryo language laboratories, but used for other subject matter as well) in which some students listen through headsets.

Multiple receivers in large rooms are used in most of the schools participating in the National Program in the Use of Television in the Schools. Examples: Mt. Eden, Calif., Miami, Kentuckiana.

Large screen projection of TV picture, although feasible, was not met in the survey. Its advantage is overcoming the small size of the TV screen; the attendant disadvantage is the necessity of darkening the room, making ventilation and note-taking difficult.

Presentation of TV lessons: The programs visited showed a great variety of ways of presenting their material. However, most of them (such as the various possible proportions of use of the native language) are essentially unrelated to the use of TV and will therefore not be mentioned here, interesting and admirable as they may be.

One set of variables involves the relations among the TV instructor, the viewer, and any other persons on the set. One procedure is straight "lecture." The TV teacher, alone, simply talks directly to the viewer, with or without blackboard or other classroom paraphernalia. The Denver project experimented with this and found it effective. One alternative is to add participation by the viewers, the TV teacher calling for responses and waiting for them, sometimes acting as though he had heard them. This procedure characterizes a majority of the FL programs. There is great variety, however, in the skill with which different teachers use the technique. A second alternative is to add a small class or group of students in the studio before the camera. The teacher then teaches them, controlling his pace by their responses; he can also elicit responses from the viewers. The first year's experimentation in Denver indicated this to be the most successful of the three procedures. It was planned, however, to check this conclusion by repeating the experiment in the spring of 1961. Other people who have commented on this problem have reported that pupils should not be used in the studio because they are a distraction; they give the viewing pupil the feeling that he is a spectator.

Besides the use of numerous properties and realia, two additional means are used to exploit TV's visual potential, in a way that would be too complicated for the ordinary classroom. One is the prepared dramatic skit to present dialog material. This is sometimes done in dramatic monolog fashion by the teacher, but more effective is the use of puppets (particularly in FLFS courses) or of a live cast. The emphasis in the initial presentation is on vividness and on cultural authenticity. The teacher then proceeds to elicit repetition from his viewers, phrase by phrase, and finally builds up the whole dialogue; sometimes the dramatization is then repeated. Examples of effective use: "Parlons Français" (both skits and puppets); Chapel Hill, N.C. (French, puppets); Urbana, Ill. (Spanish, skits); University of Florida (college French course, skits); and Language Through Television. The last, in the samples observed, presented simple but very useful dramatizations as well as animated cartoon figures. The University of Florida skit observed was paced so fast and was so complicated that it seemed doubtful that the average college student could have understood much of it. (This is an isolated observation, raising a problem; it is not a criticism of the course, which has not been observed.) Such difficulty was specifically mentioned by Leroy R. Shaw in "German on Television at the University of Texas" (*German Quarterly*, March 1961, pp. 146-153). Some of his students, at least, reported that the skits were too difficult to understand and therefore not helpful.

Similar, yet different in purpose, is the more elaborate film presentation which has been called the "cultural insert." This presents cultural material—a play or travelog, for example—to the student as passive observer. It is hoped he will understand what he hears—or at least a part of it—but not that he will reproduce it. Besides having information value, this procedure reproduces one sort of experience of the traveler in the foreign country, who understands only a small part of what he listens to; he is an observer rather than a participant in most of the native life, yet he is learning in the process. Examples: "Parlons Français," where the feature is used most lavishly, Pasadena, and perhaps many others. It requires a delicate judgment to determine the right amount of this technique, and to avoid turning the TV lesson into mere passive entertainment—or boredom.

Even the puppets—so popular in the FLES programs—were strongly criticized by one state FL supervisor. He reported that pupils subconsciously get the impression that the FL is something spoken in a falsetto voice by puppets and animals, and that when they heard him communicate to them in normal tones they showed the shock of enlightenment. His criticism may be exaggerated, but the danger is real.

The lack of "feedback" from student to teacher is one of the severest limitations of ITV. Attempts have been made to meet it head on. At Purdue, a microphone was put in the receiving room, and students were encouraged to ask their questions during the telecast. One teacher reported it was scarcely used; another felt it was useful, but pointed out that this sort of interruption would rule out the recording of programs for subsequent re-use. At Chicago City Junior College, one course invites telephone inquiries for an hour after the telecast, and this opportunity is appreciated by the students.

Authenticity of atmosphere through the use of sets is usually too expensive and complicated to be used extensively. But one recent course at Purdue used scenes projected from the rear on a transparent screen. Although the device is common in commercial television and large ETV stations, I found no other trace of it in this survey of FL courses.

Supporting activity between telecasts: Although a few people assure us that FLs can be taught using TV as the sole medium, it is more generally felt that follow-up practice is essential for effective learning. Since one of the reasons for the use of TV instruction is the shortage of trained language teachers, particularly in elementary schools, the question of who is to do the drill between TV lessons, and what is to be done, is a crucial one. It is answered in various ways. The Midwest Airborne Program plans not to recommend any procedure, leaving the whole responsibility to the participating schools. The producers of "Parlons Français," on the other hand, state that "follow-up is essential. Satisfactory achievement cannot be expected if children merely view the television lesson." They have no way of insuring that such advice will be followed, but in the Boston area, fairly elaborate measures have been taken to help the schools.

The many attempted solutions include: printed materials for classroom teachers, viewers' guides, workbooks, recordings, programmed learning materials, follow-up visits from FL specialist teachers, and various kinds of in-service training for the classroom teachers. There is not space here for a detailed discussion of this interesting and useful array of devices. But two merit special attention. The Denver project is, so far as I know, the only FLES program actively working on programmed learning materials for the self-tuition of the student, now in book form, and possibly later in machine form. Training for the teachers consists of summer institutes and workshops, periodic workshops during the year, or occasional visits from the TV teacher or a coordinator to the individual school. But more ingenious is the device by which television is asked to cure its own ills: a special TV lesson for teachers each week. This practice is followed by "Parlons Français," by the Minneapolis Spanish program, and in Chapel Hill. The teacher's lessons give a preview of the material to be covered in the pupils' lessons the following week, some hints on how to treat it, and some drill on the language itself. Satisfaction with these programs seems high. Yet it was disconcerting that the research project evaluating "Parlons Français" in 1959-60 turned up a negative correlation between pupil achievement in pronunciation and teacher participation in the teachers' program. "That is to say," in the words of the report, "that moderately fluent teachers directing their own practice (in combination with the televised children's lessons) obtained better results when they did not see the teacher programs. . . ." The researchers said, however, that they felt these factors needed further study in 1960-61. No further results are available at the time of this writing, but it seems quite likely that the teachers' program is useful despite the apparently negative results in the first study.

Some critics have pointed out that since the child will hear his classroom teacher more often than the TV teacher, he is bound to follow the wrong model. Other people have sometimes observed that if the drill is skillfully done this need not happen. One TV teacher in her work with teachers takes the direct approach and persuades them in working with their classes to mouthe the words silently until they have acquired an acceptable pronunciation.

Particularly helpful guides are provided by "Parlons Français," and most of the other programs have some sort of useful printed guide.

The most complex sets of printed materials met are provided by Language Through Television, and, according to a letter, the Minnesota German program also furnishes an elaborate set of student materials. Research in this area of activity will be mentioned presently.

EVALUATION

A genuinely critical and experimental attitude seemed typical of the projects visited, and apparently also of others. Some are highly elaborated experiments, financed by NDEA or foundation grants; others, within their more limited resources, are trying to test their effectiveness.

Many TV language programs are parts of broad

ETV experiments in all subject matter areas. The evaluations of these experiments typically take the following form: 50 comparisons were made; in 32 the TV students did better than the control group; in 18 the control group surpassed the TV students. In 21 comparisons the difference was statistically significant, 16 of which favored the TV students, and 5 the control group. General conclusion: the students who received part of their instruction over television usually did as well as, and often significantly better than, students taught in conventional classes. (The figures given are purely fictitious, but the pattern is typical.) Such comparisons have proved encouraging to sponsors of ITV programs, though perhaps a note of scepticism should be introduced, since the mere novelty of TV instruction might account for a considerable proportion of any superiority.

An evaluation report on the National Program[6] includes the following observations: (1) TV lessons are more carefully planned than conventional lessons; (2) because of the careful planning, the TV teacher can cover more ground than the conventional classroom teacher; (3) since teachers learn much by observing other teachers in action, televised teaching has proved a valuable means for in-service training. Impressions received in the course of this survey tend to bear out all three points.

We need much more precise measures, however, for FL teaching. It is to be hoped that as a result of the MLA's current program to devise tests of achievement in the language skills, we may have more meaningful measures of teaching than we have had up to now. Only then can we hope to judge teaching experiments satisfactorily. If in addition to language skills we are interested in the by-product learnings of FL study, we shall need still further tests to measure the various types of effect on the student, such as his attitudes toward foreign people and cultures.

Meanwhile, a number of the experiments in progress are of genuine interest and probably of real importance for the future of the profession. At best their testing instruments are the result of close collaboration between linguist and specialist in educational measurement. It is necessary to report, however, the distinct impression that while the educational measurements specialists are doing an excellent job of sharpening the tools, they have no material to work on, except what the linguists give them; and it is far from clear that the factors constituting linguistic learning have been satisfactorily identified by the linguists. But whatever their shortcomings these studies merit close consideration.

[6] See note 5.

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Several projects show promise not only of helping us to assay what TV has accomplished so far and how to use it, but also of giving us a little more insight into the mysterious processes of language learning. These projects are listed in Appendix A.

Denver, Colorado: "Four Years of Research on the Context of Instructional Television" (Jan. 1960—Feb. 1964); joint project, under NDEA Title VII, of Denver Public Schools and Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University; Spanish FLES program throughout the Denver schools; research so far directed at identifying the results of six types of activity: (1) TV lesson alone, (2) viewing the TV lesson again in the evening, (3) classroom practice by means of dialog, (4) classroom practice by means of pattern drill, (5) eclectic classroom practice, and (6) evening viewing and practice with parents.

Various groups of pupils have used the six activities singly and in a variety of combinations. In 1961-62 tape recordings will be added. Programmed materials are also being developed, in book form, and possibly also later in machine form. In the first stage of the project there was also some experimentation, as was reported above, on the form of presentation of the TV lesson (whether by straight "lecture" etc.), yielding the tentative conclusion that the presence of some pupils on camera is the best arrangement. The results of the re-check of this part of the study are not yet available.

University of Florida, Gainesville: Experimentation with TV instruction using (1) TV lessons designed for programmed learning, as for a teaching machine, and including visuals produced by the Modern Language Audio-Visual Research Project of Wayne University; (2) about 100 audio-tape recordings of structural drills, also designed on Skinnerian programming principles, written by Dr. Theodore Mueller of Florida, and recorded in France by the ML Audio-Visual Research Project under NDEA Title VI contract. Research has involved investigation of the role of cultural visuals (as already reported above in the discussion of aims and methods in FL teaching). Future research on the use of the programmed approach in the course will include attention to student attitudes. This project involves the most deliberate and thorough-going attempt we saw to capitalize on the distinctive features of TV at other levels than FLES.

Chicago, Illinois: Extensive research in the Chicago City Junior College, continuing a three year project (1956-59) supported by a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education to the Chicago Board of Education. Evaluation of TV instruction in the "TV College," a full two-year curriculum available entirely by TV. Comparisons of achievement of home TV viewers, classroom TV viewers, conventional classroom students, and TV viewers having additional meetings with the instructor. FL courses have been offered by TV one at a time, in rotation, among French, German, Russian, and Spanish. No FL experimental results have yet been published. However, the over-all TV venture has proved highly satisfying.

Urbana, Illinois: "Foreign Language Instruction Project," University of Illinois; Spanish FLES program in grades 4, 5, and 6 of a single elementary school. Comparison of two groups: (1) *experimental* group receiving TV instruction once a week for 20 minutes, with follow-up conducted by teachers who do not know Spanish, and (2) *contrast* group, taught "live" by an FL specialist. Groups subdivided as follows: *experimental:* (a) a class taught by a regular classroom teacher, and (b) a class taught by one experimenter, a professor of Education with no previous knowledge of Spanish; *contrast:* (a) a class taught by another experimenter who is an American linguist and professor of Spanish, and (b) a class taught by a native speaker who is a FLES specialist. A fifth, "pilot" group, which began one semester in advance of the experimental and contrast groups, taught by the TV teacher who is a native speaker and professor of Spanish, in order to develop suitable materials for the experiment.

The testing program aims to test not only FL proficiency but also the effects of FL learning on other areas of learning, and on inter-cultural attitudes. Another objective is the production of suitable materials for follow-up in TV FLES courses. A preliminary report, dated 15 November 1960, presents several findings of interest: (1) no significant difference in achievement between experimental and control groups; (2) a positive and significant correlation between IQ and Spanish achievement scores (contrary to the findings of some other studies); and (3) high, significant correlations between Spanish achievement test scores and arithmetic concept test scores; lowest correlation between English reading vocabulary test scores and Spanish achievement test scores. (It should be noted that "arithmetic concepts" and "arithmetic problem solving" were two different categories; it was the concepts, not the problem solving, which correlated highly with Spanish.) An outstanding feature of this experiment is the extremely close collaboration among the three investigators in all aspects of the program, which tends to increase one's confidence in the validity of the materials and evaluation procedures. An-

other important feature is that this phase of the program is limited to a single school, and thus escapes many pressures that would exist if it were extended throughout a whole school system. If the results of the three years' experimentation are encouraging, they plan to proceed to a large school system, where the results can be tested on a large scale.

Boston, Massachusetts: Research on the effectiveness of "Parlons Français," the series produced by the Modern Language Project of the Massachusetts Council for Public Schools. Two years of research, 1959-61, under an NDEA Title VII contract. Some first year findings: (1) follow-up was more effective when directed by the classroom teacher than when based on tape recordings; (2) the teachers' TV programs did not produce better pronunciation in the pupils (but further study of this problem was planned, as reported above in the discussion of supporting activity between telecasts); (3) "the results corroborate an earlier impression that televised instruction alone, without regular follow-up work by the classroom teacher, yields inadequate levels of achievement, particularly in comprehension and spontaneous usage of French." It was planned in the second year to explore the effects of introducing French upon the achievement in other areas of the curriculum. The second year's report is not yet available. One part of the project was also the developing of measures of several skills: aural recognition, pronunciation, rhythm and intonation, and spontaneous usage.

Chapel Hill, N.C.: Application for Title VII contract to be submitted by Professor Robert L. Hilliard, Dept. of Radio, Television and Motion Pictures, University of North Carolina, principal investigator. Experiment in Elementary College Spanish to test four methods of presentation: (1) traditional "lecture" alone, (2) TV alone, (3) radio alone, and (4) lecture, with at least 25% of the course material, above and beyond the normal use of visual aids, presented through motion pictures.

Two master's theses, one published, one in preparation, are of interest: 1. *A Comparative Study of the Effectiveness of Live and Televised French Instruction in Two Utah Schools*, by James O. Fife. Provo, Utah: 1960. In a comparison of two schools, each using one of the systems of instruction, he concludes that TV seems less effective than live instruction. 2. A classroom teacher involved in teaching 5th grade German, doing the follow-up for TV instruction, is preparing a thesis concerned with evaluation of the "Komm, Lach und Lerne" series in the Minneapolis area (Robbinsdale, Minnesota).

THE PROMISE OF TELEVISION

The evidence seems to support at least a cautiously optimistic attitude toward TV language teaching. Many fine programs are being televised, and schools in many communities are using TV lessons in admirable combination with good classroom teaching. On the other hand, the claim that TV will bring to our students only the most exceptionally well qualified teachers is a cruel hoax if taken literally. One state FL official reports that of three FLES programs in his state two are taught by teachers with minimal education, no training as teachers, and in one case minimal literacy. They make their own materials and can offer no aids to classroom teachers. One large project selected its FL teacher, without benefit of advice from the FL teaching profession, on the basis of TV personality. Another large project has for its FL teacher a person of admirable energy, enthusiasm, and warm personal charm, who speaks the FL with the skill of a typical student in a second-year college course. There is no reason to suppose that such situations will cease to exist. But in no case do they seem bad enough to warrant condemning the use of TV. The inexperienced teachers may become experts. (One inexperienced teacher observed in the survey is doing a far better job than some veterans.) The TV personalities may turn out to be excellent teachers of the FL as well *if they can be induced to take the advice of linguists every step of the way for a while.* The teacher with less than satisfactory facility with the language is doing a remarkable public relations job for the FL and the foreign culture, which has not yet backfired. Yet the fact remains that these are not the proven leaders we were promised, nor were they chosen with criteria which can be relied upon to turn up exceptionally qualified teachers.

What has TV done to the over-all effectiveness of FL teaching? The principal effect, of course, has been in the grade school. The quantitative impact is clear: TV is causing an explosive expansion of FLES teaching. Its qualitative effect is not so easy to estimate. Should we compare the actuality with the ideal, or with the best non-TV teaching, or with the average of live teaching, or with FLES teaching as it was before TV, or with what we would probably have now if it were not for TV? I can report seeing live FLES classes far more successful than any TV teaching that I observed. But this is a fragmentary and fallible observation.

In any case, the verdict will depend partly on whether we accept the perfectionism inherent in the MLA recommendations already cited: no FLES without (1) providing qualified teachers, (2) giving it serious attention in the curriculum, and (3) providing for continuity through grade 12. If it is evil to encourage FLES in violation of these precepts, then the influence of TV has probably been pernicious so far. Probably the majority of TV FLES schools fall down on the third point; many fall down on the second; and relatively few can qualify on the first: though the TV teacher may be well qualified, the classroom follow-up teacher, not being trained in the FL (for which no one can blame her), is not able to do a professional job.

On this last point, however, we have seen how much imaginative and constructive effort has gone into solving the problem. TV at least gets a high mark for effort, and for considerable achievement as well. We cannot discount the findings of experiments where properly aided classroom teachers' pupils have achieved essentially as much as the pupils of the professional FL teacher. But the scope and nature of the problem are well illustrated by a comment from a superb TV teacher who regularly visits her classrooms and helps classroom teachers where she can. She has found that the "quality of the children's accent is generally inversely proportionate to the amount of French spoken to them by the classroom teacher." And in observing the effects of some poorly qualified FLES teaching, one FL director remarked: "With luck a good program may get these children back up to zero in two years."

Since TV is very much with us, but also very expensive in production, and usually done with strictly limited resources, at least we can ask whether the available resources are wisely distributed among these factors: elaborateness of production, length and frequency of telecasts, teacher-training activities, and audio-visual materials. A subjective reaction, upon observing a gargantuan range of expenditure on production, is that there is surprisingly little correlation between it and effectiveness. One of the most effective and beautiful programs—a delight to behold—seemed clearly to be the most lavish production (though I did not inquire into the budget figures). Yet one course produced on a shoestring competes so well with it that one wonders whether it would not have made a greater contribution if half the budget had been spent on doubling the number of lessons in the series instead of on production extras such as films shot in the foreign country.

Probably we must regard TV in FL instruction just as we have regarded textbooks (an idea by no means original here). The textbook does a great deal of what the teacher would do if we had no books. Some people make the mistake of trying to make it substitute for the teacher, but adequate

instruction requires finding a proper relation between the roles of textbook and teacher. The same is true of TV as of the textbook. We shall have to learn by experience what the proper proportions are; and we shall always have to make compromises between the ideal and the reality of our limited resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A survey of things as they are inevitably leads to suggestions for change. The following recommendations are offered for the consideration of the profession.

1. A clearing house of information. The large national organizations most closely concerned with ETV, although most cooperative within the limits of their resources, had only fragmentary and out-of-date information. The gathering of mere factual data necessary for conducting this survey had to be done by individual inquiries to TV broadcasters, producers, educational administrators, and teachers, as I learned of them. These inquiries were an imposition on their recipients. Broadcasters indicated that they receive literally dozens of such inquiries each week. If one national agency could gather and process such data as a matter of routine, educational research would be facilitated and there would be a vast saving of time and resources. Is it too much to hope that the U.S. Office of Education should be given the resources to take on this function?

2. Measures to end the isolation in which most TV teachers and producers are working. True, we must avoid over-standardization. But there is unnecessary waste in the present duplication of effort. Two remedies suggest themselves. One is the creation of a national corps of consultants on FL telecourses. Such a group, consisting of one to three experts in each language plus two or three specialists in TV production and curriculum planning, could perform a very useful service by aiding in the planning of new courses, helping in the design of materials, and criticizing on-going projects. A second suggested remedy would be a large national fund to subsidize intervisitation among TV teachers of FLs. This might provide more constructive training than most study programs, by enabling teachers to see other programs in action rather than hearing about them at second hand.

3. Producers of TV courses should give consideration to combining resources. In one state two beginning Spanish courses are being produced side by side, one for the capital city, the other for surrounding areas. Both school systems would like to have a two-year series, yet both would find this difficult economically. Exchanging programs, one of them producing the first level, the other the second, would solve the economic problem, and probably improve the quality of both programs. The same problem exists in every part of the country.

4. The greater use of videotape recording in order to use the TV teacher's talents more efficiently. It is commendable not to be satisfied with one's efforts, and to want to change and improve. But where videotape facilities are available there would be a tremendous saving if each course were recorded and used at least once again, thus relieving the TV teacher of the pressures of production, allowing him to give more attention to the classroom teachers, and in the process to do a better job of revising his course the following year. Not to do this seems wasteful.

5. A more nearly exhaustive survey. The present survey has resulted in the conviction that far more needs to be known than could be discovered in an investigation of this scope. We are still too dependent on conjecture and extrapolation. This survey has served to emphasize the extent of our ignorance. A team of perhaps five observers working for a year could approach complete coverage, and conduct much more thorough investigations.

CONCLUSION

The questions with which this report opened can be given answers, subject to confirmation by future developments. A single, skillful, inspired teacher, on a city-wide or nation-wide network, can not and will not be able to do the work of several hundred, or a hundred, classroom teachers—or of one classroom teacher. Such a television teacher can, however, do *a significant part* of the work of several hundred teachers.

Television is not *the answer* to the shortage of teachers, but insofar as TV teaching of foreign languages is done by skillful, inspired teachers, backed by sound advice from linguists and producers, and by a sound program in the schools, television can be *a major part* of the solution to this problem. The virtue is not in the TV tube or in any one person in the studio. It is in all the people who collaborate in its use.

APPENDIX A

Teaching programs and research projects mentioned in the sections dealing with "Procedures Employed in FL Programs" and "Research in Progress."

1. California, Anaheim. Anaheim City School District, 412 East Broadway. James D. Brier, Educational Television Coordinator. Frank Robles and Paul Juárez, teachers.
2. California, Mt. Eden. Mt. Eden Elementary School District, 26136 Hesperian Blvd., Hayward. Charles Reed, Asst. Superintendent, Instructional Services. Spanish program of San Francisco, q.v.
3. California, Pasadena. Pasadena City Schools, 351 South Hudson Ave. Mrs. Yvette A. Miller, teacher.
4. California, San Diego. San Diego City Schools, Education Center, Park Blvd. at El Cajon. Mrs. Margit W. MacRae, Assistant Supervisor of Conversational Spanish, and teacher.
5. California, San Francisco. Station KQED, 525 Fourth St. Manuel H. Guerra, teacher, Mt. Eden School District. See 2.
6. Colorado, Denver. James T. Johnson, Jr., Project Director for the Denver Public Schools. Research Project Office, 1261 Glenarm Pl.
7. Florida, Miami. Clementine Carlaftes, Coordinator, Conversational Spanish, Dade County Public Schools, Lindsey Hopkins Bldg., 1410 N.E. 2nd Ave.
8. Florida, Univ. of. Prof. Theodore Mueller, c/o WUFT-TV, 234 Stadium, Gainesville.
9. Georgia, Athens. Mrs. Mary Grubbs, Coordinator of Educational TV. Mrs. Yvonne H. Wright, teacher. c/o WLW-A-TV, 1611 West Peachtree St., N.E., Atlanta 9. (Programs broadcast from WGTV, Athens.)
10. Illinois, Chicago. Chicago City Junior College, Wright Branch, 3400 North Austin Ave. Clifford G. Erickson, Dean of TV Instruction.
11. Illinois, Urbana. FL Instruction Project, 805 West Pennsylvania Ave. Charles E. Johnson, Administrative Director.
12. Indiana, Lafayette. Purdue Univ. J. Collins Orr, Associate Professor of Modern Languages.
13. Kentuckiana. Kentuckiana Educational Television Council, 5337 Dixie Highway, Louisville 16. Mrs. Roy Cobb, Producer-Coordinator.
14. "Language Through Television." Language Research, Inc. Peabody House, 13 Kirkland St., Cambridge 38, Mass. Christine Gibson, Director.
15. Massachusetts, Boston. Research in the Boston area on the use and effectiveness of "Parlons Français." Modern Language Project of the Massachusetts Council for Public Schools, 9 Newbury St. Ralph Garry, Research Associate.
16. Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instruction. Memorial Center, Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Indiana. Ben A. Bohnhorst, Director of Educational Materials.
17. Minnesota, Minneapolis. Spanish program. Minnesota Council for School Television, 1640 Como Ave., St. Paul 13. Howard Hathaway, teacher.
18. Minnesota, Robbinsdale. German program, Minneapolis area. Independent School District 281. 5214 37th Ave. Hedi Oplesch, teacher.
19. North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Station WUNC-TV, Univ. of North Carolina. Mrs. Marian M. Walter, teacher.
20. "Parlons Français." See Boston, Massachusetts. Mrs. Anne Slack, teacher.
21. Purdue University, see Lafayette, Indiana.

APPENDIX B

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TELECOURSES, 1960–61

viations:

French
German
Japanese
Latin
Russian
Spanish
closed circuit

coll: college
elem: elementary school, grade unspecified
HS: high school or jr. high school
ed: educational
*: program observed by J. R. Reid
ETV: educational television
lv: live program
Vt: videotape
Ks: kinescope
cl: classroom teacher
sp: FL specialist teacher
TVt: television teacher
mtg: meeting of students & teacher
sem: semester
inf: information

ion: Station, nel, Institution	language	grade level	language level	times per week	length of telecast	form of telecast	Other information
ma	F		elem				
usia WAIQ—2	F	coll					Wade Coleman, TVt, 1958–59. Inf. from NETRC inconsistent with inf. from network.
ngham WBIQ—10	S	elem	elem	2	30		
rd WCIQ—7	S	HS	2	3	30		
ma ETV Network							
a	S	coll	1	3	50	lv	Renato Rosaldo, TVt. Follow-up.
n KUAT—6 Arizona							
nia	S	4	1	4	15+	lv	Follow-up, cl.
eim, cc	S	5, 6	2	2	15+	lv	Follow-up, cl.
nia	S	5	1	2	30	Vt	Mrs. Yvette Miller, TVt. Follow-up, cl.
ngeles City and	S	6	2	2	30	Vt	Follow-up, cl. Plan to retape these as 15 min. 3x/wk.
-13 ed in Pasadena							
nia	S	4–8	1	1	20		Film; Follow-up.
ento	S	4–8	2	1	20	Vt	Follow-up, cl. Sacramento reported by ML Project of Boston to be using "Parlons Français." No other information to this effect.
–6 school districts, 0,000 children es K–12)							
nia iego	S	5, 6	1		30	Ks	Mrs. Margit W. MacRae, TVt. Follow-up, cl.+sp. Series of 18 Ks made in TV studio of ccTV at San Diego State Coll. Ks films used in schools; no ETV broadcast time available except 30 min. Sat. AM on KFMB—TV—8.
ia	S	4(–6)	1	1	15	Ks	Manuel Guerra, TVt.
ancisco area	S	5(–7)	2	2	15	Vt	Follow-up, cl. in most schools.
–9	S	6(–8)	3	2	15	lv	68 public school districts, especially Mt. Eden, plus 14 private schools.
	F	4–5		2	15	Vt	"Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH.
o	F	5	1	3	15	Vt	Miss Lee Sparkman, TVt.
and environs TV—6	F	6	2	2	12		
Wyo. also ts these tapes.	S	5	1	3	15	Vt	Fred Manzanares, TVt.
	S	6	2	2	15		Spanish TV program the subject of the most extensive experimentation done in FL instruction.
lle –5 of 9 counties	S	3	1			Vt	Produced by Alachua County Public Schools

Location: Station, Channel, Institution	language	grade level	language level	times per week	length of telecast	form of telecast	Other information
U. of Florida course	F	coll	1st sem	3	30	Vt	Theodore Mueller, TVt. Follow-up 20 min. plus lab. Experiment begun 1958–59. Ford grant 1959–69. Cultural slides from Wayne U ML A-V Research Project: c. 100 audio tape drills of 30 min. Also offered for credit in the evening through Univ. Extension; and in Jacksonville, Tampa, St. Petersburg; and in Miami to Dade County Jr. College.
	F	coll	2nd sem	2	30	Vt	
Florida Jacksonville WJCT—7 All elem. schools in Duval County (89) and Baker County (6) and some others	S	3	1	3	30	lv	Mrs. Nell Kaumwischer, TVt. Follow-up, cl.
Florida *Miami WTHS-TV—2 Span. in about 42 schools in Dade County	S	5, 6	1	3	10	lv & Vt	Completely new TV course planned for 1961–62. New TVt Sue Kerr. lv, repeated once same day on Vtape, not saved. Miriam Amor, TVt, 1960–61. Th. Mueller's course from U of Florida. See Gainesville. Used in Dade County Jr. College.
	F	coll adult				Vt	
Florida Tampa WEDU—3 school systems of 7 counties. Span. rec'd by 7,000 students	S	4	1	3	20	lv	Follow-up, not clear whether this is a 2 yr. sequence or same course to 2 grades.
	S	5	2?	?	?	lv	
	F	coll adult				Vt	Th. Mueller's course on Vt from U of Florida. See Gainesville. No follow-up.
Georgia *Athens WGTV—8 to 51 school systems in northern Georgia	S	5–7	1	2	30	Vt	Mrs. Yvonne Wright, TVt. Last 10 min. written. Each teacher has option of using course or not. Planning revised course for 1961–62.
Georgia Atlanta WETV—30	F	3, 4	1			lv	Odette Morphy, TVt
	F	4, 5	2			lv	
	S	2, 3	1			lv	Georgiana Martinez, TVt. Follow-up, cl.
	S	3, 4	2			lv	
Illinois *Chicago WTTW—11 Chicago City Jr. College, "TV College," entire curriculum available on TV. Have given only one semester of each of 4 FLs in rotation	F	coll	1st sem	2	43		Dr. and Mrs. John Downey, TVt's. 8 mtgs. per sem. in addition to TV.
	S	coll	1st sem	2	43		1961–62. Albert Donnell, TVt.
Illinois *Urbana U. of Illinois cc TV project. Experiment in one elem. school.	S	4	1	1	20	lv	A thorough experiment to test materials for follow-up by cl teacher. Joseph Flores, TVt.
	S	5	2	1	20	lv	
	S	6	3	1	20	lv	
Indiana Evansville WTVW—7	S	3	1	3	15	lv	5992 pupils 1959–60. Mabel Lene Hammond, TVt. Plan 3rd level for 1961–62
	S	4	2	2	15	lv	

ocation: Station, hannel, Institution	language	grade level	language level	times per week	length of telecast	form of telecast	Other information
uthwestern Indiana TV uses facilities from 00 to 11:55 AM daily.							
diana afayette	F F	3–6 elem teach	1	4 1	20 15	Vt Vt	Zelik Zeff, TVt.
idwest Airborne Pro-am on TV.							
irborne" will be re-ived in six states by an imated 530,000 stu-nts	S S	3–6 elem teach	1	4 1	20 15	Vt Vt	Benito Lueras, TVt.
	S	HS	1	4	30	Vt	Originally announced but omitted from schedule 3/24/61
	R	coll	1	4	30	Vt	Thais Lindstrom, TVt. Total program will be broadcast over 2 channels, 6 hrs a day, 4 days a wk.
va s Moines OPS-TV—11	S S	5 6	1 2?	4? 4?		lv & Vt lv & Vt	Follow-up, cl., 3150 students. Follow-up, cl., 2423 students.
va son City GLO-TV orth counties, schools, 6689 pupils	S S	6 7	1 2?			lv lv	
atucky uisville PK-TV—15 UHF ntuckiana V Council	S S S	3, 4 4 5, 6	1 2 3	3 3 3	15 15 15	lv lv lv	Miss Sue Robinson, TVt. Mrs. Betty McKay, TVt. Miss Sue Robinson, TVt. KETVC a large, vital program, to 5 counties in Kentucky, one in Indiana, and 11 parochial schools.
isiana w Orleans ES-TV—8 eans Parish School tem	F	3, 4, 5	?	2	15	Vt	"Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH.
ryland timore Z-TV	F	4	1	2	10	lv	Mrs. Mendes, TVt.
ryland lege Park of Maryland, cc	S	coll	1	2	50		Frank Goodwyn, TVt. 2 hrs. a wk. of small group drill in addition to TV. Formerly gave course over broadcast TV to public.
yland gerstown shington County V Project, cc	F F	4 5–7	1 2	5 5	10 10		
yland sbury OC-TV (?) -Mar-Va ETV 3 communities in aware, Maryland & ginia	F F	4, 5 5, 6	1 2				
ssachusetts ston BH-TV—2 rlons Français" ram distributed	F F F F	4 5 (4) (5)	1 2 (1) (1)	2 2 1 1	15 15 15 15	Vt Vt	Mme. Anne Slack, TVt. Program for teachers.

Location: Station, Channel, Institution	language	grade level	language level	times per week	length of telecast	form of telecast	Other information
nationwide through Heath-DeRochemont, Inc. & NETRC. Produced by Modern Language Project of the Mass. Council for Public Schools.							
Michigan Detroit WTVS—56 To Detroit public schools and a wide surrounding area	S S S S	3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	 2 2	 30 30	lv lv lv lv	Sylvia Herrera, TVt.
	F F G	3 4 3	1 2 1	4 5 5	20 20 20	lv lv lv	Edward J. Kroll, TVt. Ronald Salter, TVt. All three FLs being extended to a 4 yr. sequence. Former French TVt, Zelik Zeff, now with Midwest Airborne, Lafayette, Ind.
Michigan East Lansing Onondaga WMSB—10 Mich. State U. ETV station program for 42 school districts in area	F F S S F	4, 5 elem? elem elem	1? 1 2? 1	2 1 4 4 3	15 30 15 15 30	Vt Vt Ks	"Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH. "Parlons Français" teachers' program "French Through TV" (Net program)
Minnesota Minneapolis-St. Paul KTCA-TV—2 Minn. Council for School TV	G S S	4 up 4 up (4 up)	1 1 (1)	3 3 1	15 15 30		Robbinsdale Schools, Hedi Oplesch, TVt. Minnesota Council for School TV, Howard Hathaway, TVt. Teachers' program, Howard Hathaway. Plan a sequence of 3 courses in S, grades 4–6
Missouri Kansas City KCSD-TV—9-UHF "cc" to KC schools	S	3–5	1	5	12		Miss Flora Flores, TVt. No cl follow-up.
Nebraska Lincoln KUON-TV—12 Nebraska Council for ETV	F	4	1	2	15	Vt	Said to have had lessons in French, German, & Spanish in recent past. Station reports none now. "Parlons Français" planned for 1961–62. See Boston, WGBH.
New Hampshire *Durham WENH—11	F F	4 5	1 2	2 2	15 15	Vt	"Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH.
New Mexico Albuquerque KNME-TV—5	S S	4–6 4–6	1 2	2 2		lv lv	Alfredo Chávez, TVt. No follow-up. Broadcast in evening, but KNME reports program received in large number of public schools.
New Mexico Albuquerque U. of New Mexico							No inf. beyond a report that there is a Spanish TV project, apparently not FLES.
New York Albany							Have had some experience in past. Hope to resume teaching

ion: Station, nel, Institution	language	grade level	language level	times per week	length of telecast	form of telecast	Other information
York State U. ge of Education							college Spanish 1961–62 by TV with laboratory.
York lo D—17 rn New York Assn.	F F G G S	4–6 5–7 4–6 5–7 4–6	1 2 1 2 1			lv lv lv lv lv	Follow-up, cl.
York nd "Cortland ETV t"	G	9	1	5	40		Mrs. Roy Pappas, TVt.
York Neck, L. I.							No inf. beyond a report from Paul M. Glaude, FL Supervisor State Ed. Dept., Albany, that Great Neck has a ccTV program including FL.
York York a ccTV	Eng. as FL					Ks	"English Through Television" Program being discontinued.
York York -TV—11 s ETV Project 2 program (radi- hanged from 51)	S S F	5 6 4	? ? 1	3 2 2	20 20 15	Ks Vt	Ks of 1960–61 course "Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH.
York ster C-TV ster Area Council	F	3,4	?	4	?		To all schools in 10 county area. Follow-up, cl.
York ctady 3-TV—6 k Hudson Council V	F F F F	3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	2 1 1	15 15 15	Vt lv lv lv	"Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH. Follow-up, cl. Mohawk-Hudson Council program. Follow-up, cl. Optional viewing of 3rd level TV plus live instruction in class
ork e el-8							Letter from Paul M. Glaude, FL Supervisor, State Ed. Dept. Albany, says there is FL instruction via TV in Syracuse. No further inf.
Carolina l Hill -TV—4	F F	4,5 5,6	1 2	3 3	15 15	lv lv	Mrs. Marian Walter, TVt. Follow-up, cl. French teachers' program 30 min. weekly for each level. Plans for 1961–62 uncertain, but may extend to a third year of TV in sequence.
ati —48 xperimental tele- asis" to 20 school of the 40 in the g area.	F	4	1	2	15	Vt	"Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH.

Location: Station, Channel, Institution	language	grade level	language level	times per week	length of telecast	form of telecast	Other information
Ohio Columbus WOSU-TV—34	F F	3 4	1 2	2? 2?	15 15	lv	Mrs. Berns, TVt.
Ohio Lima	S S	5 6	1 2?	? ?	? ?	lv	Follow-up, cl.
	G	coll				Ks	Ohio State U. Branch (inf. from W1MA-TV).
Oklahoma Oklahoma City KETA-TV—13 Tulsa KOED-TV—11 Oklahoma ETV Authority	S S	3 4	1 2	3 3	15 15	lv lv	Follow-up, cl.
Oklahoma Oklahoma City KOKH-TV—25	F F	3 4	1 2	? ?	15 15	lv lv	Follow-up, cl. Reports from Oklahoma were inconsistent.
Oregon Corvallis KOAC-TV—7	F	3–5	1?	2	15	Vt	"Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH. Follow-up, cl. Station reports grades 3–5, but since this is the first year they have used the program, it probably is only the 1st-level series this year.
Oregon Portland KGW-TV							Reported by ML Project of Boston to be using "Parlons Français." Letter from state consultant on FLs does not indicate this. Station did not answer inquiry.
Oregon Springfield-Eugene-Bethel							Area reported to have a TV program of 6th grade Spanish since 1959. No further inf. Informant: Paul M. Arriola, FL Consultant, State Dept. of Ed., Salem.
Pennsylvania Altoona, Harrisburg, and Lancaster							Reported to be using "Saludos Amigos," Manuel Guerra's 1st-level program; see San Francisco. No further inf. Informant: Louisette Logan, MFL Specialist, Dept. of Public Instruction, Harrisburg.
Pennsylvania Philadelphia WHYY-TV—35-UHF This inf. from WHYY, purporting to be total program.	F	4–6	?	?	?	lv	Follow-up, cl.
This inf. from NETRC, purporting to be 1960–61.	F F F F S S	elem elem HS 4 5	1 2 3 1? 2?	3 3 3 3 3 3?	? ? ? 30 ?	 	 For Teachers
Pennsylvania Pittsburgh	F	elem	?	2?	15	Vt	"Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH. Follow-up, cl.

ation, titution	language	grade level	language level	times per week	length of telecast	form of telecast	Other information
	S	elem	?	?	?	Ks	Informant does not say whether more than one level (from Denver, Colo.).
a ark State U. ademic Re- ervices. mental							A significant and thorough experiment in the use of TV in college teaching in general. This project was not visited or analyzed, because of lack of time.
na na ETV broadcast	F	HS	1	5	?		Mme. Lucille Turney-High, TVt. Follow-up, cl. Plan full 4 yr. sequence on TV. Promise modern audio lingual method, using Mauger: *Cours de langue et de civilisation françaises.* Plan new program for 1961–62
	S	3,4	1?				Edith W. Davis, TVt.
	F F	4,5 5,6	1 2	3 3	? ?		Mrs. Winston Massey, TVt.
–10	S S	3 4	1 2?	3? 3?	12 12	Ks Ks	The Seattle program.
	F G	coll coll	1 1				Alexandre Goulet, TVt. Ferdinand Gowa, TVt.
	G J	coll coll	1 1			Vt Vt	Leroy Shaw, TVt. German Vt's available to students for reviewing. Mrs. Mieko Han, TVt.
–13	S S	1–3 4–6	1 2	3 3	15 30		
ademy	L	HS?	1				French formerly taught by TV, but discontinued upon opening of language lab.
ton) blic Schools	S	3	1		30	Vt	Feb.–April experiment, 1961. Results will determine continuation of TV Spanish teaching. Follow-up in half the experimental schools.
–23	S	3,4	1	?	?	lv	Mrs. Raymon Bynum, TVt.
ity	F F	elem ?	1 2	3 3	15 15?		

Location: Station, Channel, Institution	language	grade level	language level	times per week	length of telecast	form of telecast	Other information
KUED—7	F R R	4,5 elem ?	1 1 2	2 3 3?	15 35? ?	Vt	"Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH.
Washington *Seattle KCTS-TV—9	S S F	4 5 2	sem 2 sem 3 1	3 3 2	12 12 15	Ks Ks Ks	Mrs. Mercedes Edgerton, TVt. Mme. Claudine Erlandson Dubois, TVt. Planned for 1961–62: "Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH Follow-up, cl (for all programs)
Washington Spokane KREM-TV—2	G	5	1	5	30	Vt	Wilma Tupper, TVt. This inf. is for spring 1960. The program was a 3-yr. experiment, however, and is presumably continuing.
Washington Tacoma KPEC-TV—56 Lakewood Center	S	4, 5	1	3	15	lv	Bonnie Rediske, TVt. Follow-up, cl.
West Virginia Huntington	R	adult	1	3			Richard Steele, TVt. Marshall U. College credit
Wisconsin Madison WHA-TV—21	F	7	1	2	15	iv & Vt	Follow-up, cl. Tentative plans for 1961–62 include extending the above with a second year; also instituting "Parlons Français" (see Boston, WGBH) in elementary grades.
Wisconsin Milwaukee WMVS-TV—10	F S S	4–6 4–6 4–6	1 1 1	2	15	Vt lv lv	"Parlons Français." See Boston, WGBH. To Catholic schools, follow-up, cl. To public schools, no follow up. Inf. not clear as to whether more than one level involved. "Parlons Français" is new this year, also the public-school Spanish.
Wyoming Casper	F F S S	5 6 5 6	1 2 1 1	3 2 3 2	15 12 15 15	Vt Vt Vt Vt	Programs from Denver.

Number of listed courses in each language:

F—67
G— 9
J— 1
L— 1
R— 4
S—75

Number of listed courses at each level:

Elementary	Secondary	College
125	8	21

Number of listed telecasts of each given length:

10 min.— 4
12 min.— 7
15 min.—54
20 min.—13
30 min.—21
35 min.— 1
40 min.— 2
43 min.— 2
50 min.— 2